## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRADLEY A. ARNDT,

Plaintiff,

V.

District Judge Paul D. Borman Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

Case No. 2:15-cv-11108

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Defendant.

ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S SECOND AMENDED PRIVILEGE LOG (DE 73)

On February 16, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel communications made by a human resources team reviewing his ADA request with in-house counsel, Anthony W. Dalimonte. Specifically, Plaintiff challenged fifteen items listed in Defendant's privilege log and sought an *in camera* review of those items to determine if any of the documents were not protected (or were only partially protected) by attorney-client privilege. (*See* DE 57-1 at 8-9.) I granted in part and denied in part Plaintiff's motion, and ordered Defendant to amend its privilege log with respect to eleven of the fifteen entries to provide sufficient detail as to the subject matter of the communications. (DE 68.) Defendant's revised privilege log was to be filed on or before March 30, 2016.

2:15-cv-11108-PDB-APP Doc # 74 Filed 04/12/16 Pg 2 of 2 Pg ID 1676

Defendant emailed a revised privilege log to my chambers on March 24,

2016, but did not file it on the docket, perhaps confusing the issue of whether I

would be doing an *in camera* review of the privilege log itself. In any event, after

requesting that the document be filed on the docket, Defendant did so on April 7,

2016 and I will consider that filing timely. (DE 73.)

I have reviewed the second amended privilege log and conclude that

Defendant has provided sufficient detail as to the subject matter of the

communications, such that an *in camera* review of the documents is unnecessary.

See, e.g., Sid Mike 99, L.L.C. v. Suntrust Bank, No. 2:07-cv-02453-STADKV,

2009 WL 3255209, at \*5-6 (W.D. Tenn. Oct. 6, 2009). Accordingly, I will not

order an *in camera* review of the fifteen documents identified as privileged by

Defendant and challenged by Plaintiff, and the amended privilege log (DE 73) is

deemed sufficient.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 12, 2016

s/Anthony P. Patti

Anthony P. Patti

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

I certify that a copy of this document was sent to parties of record on Tuesday, April 12, 2016,

electronically and/or by U.S. Mail.

s/Michael L. Williams

Case Manager to the

Honorable Anthony P. Patti

2